DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 382 EA 009 297

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Petra E.
TITLE Administrative Training Needs of Community Service Agency Administrators, c. 1976.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, N.Y., April 4-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Communication (Thought Transfer); Community Agencies (Public); *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Higher Education; *Inservice Education; Motivation; Needs Assessment; Personnel Management; Program Development; *Public Administration Education; Surveys; Taxonomy
IDENTIFIERS *Wisconsin (Milwaukee County)

ABSTRACT

The demographic data and model survey instruments used in a study of 444 Wisconsin administrators of schools, universities, hospitals, correction institutions, and governmental agencies are described. A taxonomy of 58 desired competencies grouped by (1) general management techniques, (2) personnel administration, (3) legal requirements, (4) communication and motivation, (5) program development, (6) finance, and (7) output assessment and evaluation resulted from this study. The data base can be linked to policy decision by educational systems to design and implement interdisciplinary, inservice training programs in administration. The instruments can be applied periodically to determine if administrative training needs and opportunities are still relevant. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136382

Petra E. Chamberlain, Ph.D.
College of Education
Texas Woman's University
Denton, Texas 76204
AERA Session 16.17, 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING NEEDS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS c. 1976

Organizations are perhaps the most ubiquitous characteristic of modern society. They seem to come in all sizes and shapes, from the small and intimate group working on a local issue of micro-cosmic import to the large, complex bureaucracies of business, industry, and government that directly affect the daily lives of millions of people.

Business enterprise is only one of the organizations of modern society, and business managers are by no means the only kind of administrators. Community service agencies--schools and universities, professional associations, hospitals and social service agencies, and many others--are also organizations and, therefore, equally in need of managers. Consequently, they all have people in administrative positions, even though they may not be called managers, but administrators, chiefs, directors, or executives. These people perform certain management functions which require particular skills.

Although community service agencies comprise the major growth sector of economic activity in terms of resources consumed, and have been expanding faster than manufacturing in this century, actual output performance has not kept up with growth in resources used (Drucker, 1974). Increasing public criticism

EA 009 297

over poor performance by schools, social service agencies, hospitals, government and correctional institutions is frequently the result of these organizations' failure to attain their noble and lofty objectives. Subsequently, much public discontent appears to be centered around four areas: 1) failure to respond effectively to the needs of the service agency clientele; 2) inconsistent and badly organized service techniques; 3) dehumanizing, degrading, and insensitive organizational processes in dealing with individual needs; and 4) ill-managed, wasteful, and inefficient operations concerning an ever-increasing share of public and private funds (Hasenfeld & English, 1974, p. 3). In addition, performance of service agencies may be constrained by affirmative action hiring practices, which result in representatives from the clientele the organization is designed to serve, such as Afro-Americans, American Indians, women, the physically handicapped, being appointed to administrative positions. Such appointment is not necessarily by virtue of the Weberian (1947) principle of high level technical training but, rather, because of empathetic connection. It is particularly the criticism--of mismanagement and poor performance--which provided the impetus for this study. The implicit charge that "someone is responsible" forms the basis for investigating the preparation and training of the managers of these institutions as well as their needs for on-the-job training to maintain and upgrade their skills. Once these needs have been identified they can be utilized in the design of in-service training pro-

grams to facilitate professional development through continuing learning activities.

The manager, as the organization's director of resource allocations and central decision-maker, is charged with the responsibility for overall accomplishment of agency objectives and operational goals. The quality of the administrators and the development and proper use of their full potentialities through training programs may well determine the degree of success or failure of human service organizations. In view of their growth, size and importance, the demand for managers of these organizations to be well trained has intensified (U. S. Occupational Handbook 1974-75). To satisfy the increasing demand for management specialists, particularly in the service industry, the National Manpower Council urges "developing executive and managerial skills and capacities in employees through programs of training" (1974, p. 19). The Manpower Report of the President not only identified and recognized the need for higher education systems to train people in the human service categories but pointed out that "it is still not clear to what degree colleges and universities will be required to extend their efforts in the fields of adult education or professional retraining" (1973, p. 77).

Training programs specifically geared to administrators of service organizations are rare and usually subordinated to the business management context of providing a market consumer with a particular article rather than delivery of a service. Similarly, management training programs that offer some

body of content, a core that will serve the needs of administrators across all service organizations, are particularly lacking in higher education systems. Business, public, and educational administration departments in most universities and colleges strive to prepare managers or administrators in their special brand of knowledge "stressing that which is unique to the neglect of that which is common" (Miklos, 1972, p. 5).

Critics of in-common training programs of administration point out that fragmentation seriously impairs the development of concepts and theories that would advance the knowledge base of the individual disciplines (Walton, 1970; Goldhammer, 1968; Campbell, 1958). Proponents of common programs, i.e., Lichtfield (1956), Thompson (1960), Parsons (1956), and Culbertson (1965), maintain, however, that there are sufficient commonalities among administrative or management processes in different organizations that the pursuit of the development of a science of administration or training programs of administration is worthwhile. One positive step in that direction is to determine the kinds of educational needs, particularly the administrative training needs, of the people who are currently managing community service agencies. Once these needs have been identified they can be utilized in the design of in-common training programs to facilitate professional development through continuing learning activities.

A study which assessed the administrative training needs of agency administrators by administering an in-depth question-

naire survey to 568 heads of major service agencies in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin was conducted by this writer (Chamberlain, 1975).

The specific purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To assess the administrative training needs of community service agency administrators, i.e., administrative heads of service organizations in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin;

2. To determine the training background and preparation of agency administrators, i.e., pre- and in-service training, and years of experience in administration;

3. To determine desirable administrative training formats, i.e., length, technique, and form;

4. To determine impediments to administrative training, i.e., human, material, and budgetary obstacles;

5. To identify educational resources and delivery systems known to be available for the training of agency administrators;

6. To provide a data base for the development of administrative in-service training programs and subsequent policy formulations.

The Study Population

The projected universe of the study was to be all of the service agencies in Milwaukee County.[1] In lieu of a comprehensive directory of such agencies, a list compiled by the Wisconsin

---

[1]Milwaukee County is the legally defined boundary which includes the City of Milwaukee and 18 suburban municipalities.

Information Resource File (WIS) was used. This listing is located on both a card index and a computer tape and contains 568 agency names.

WIS built its file by locating and listing the following types of organizations:

1. major human service providers, from both the public and private sectors--departments of public welfare, county institutions, municipal health departments, fire departments, police departments, family and child service agencies, and family service;

2. agencies serving older adults--senior service centers, transportation services, recreation programs;

3. major providers of housing related services, including municipal building inspection departments, federal housing agencies, public housing authorities, and private housing agencies;

4. other categories of service agencies not falling into any of the preceding three categories.

The data in the WIS file thus made it possible to classify agencies by name, governance characteristics, and service categories.

Sample[1]

The study was conducted by the use of three separate inter-

[1]For a discussion on sampling procedures, crossbreaks and frequency counts, see F. N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), Chapters 8 and 10; and Stephen Isaac, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, 1971), p. 121.

view instruments: a pilot instrument, a semi-structured instrument, and a structured instrument. A pilot instrument, which was lengthy and open-ended, was designed to identify key areas of concern. The semi-structured instrument, shorter, more focused, and more structured than the pilot instrument, was based upon the results obtained from the pilot instrument. The third and final instrument was based upon the results of the first two instruments and was still more brief, more focused, and more structured. Each of these instruments required its own sample, with the more lengthy and more open-ended instrument having the smaller sample, and the final instrument the largest sample.

The sample for the pilot instrument consisted of the head administrators of seven service agencies which were suggested by the United Community Services of Greater Milwaukee, Inc., and which comprise a cross section of the following service areas: housing, government, education, family, "well person," and volunteer. The smallness of sample at this initial stage of instrument development appeared to present little handicap since this phase was primarily exploratory, with the purpose of developing improved survey instruments rather than obtaining definitive and final results.

The goal in applying the second instrument was to collect data from a sample large enough to approach the universe population in all significant characteristics but small enough to analyze, given the time, cost and utility constraints, in a

fashion which, like the pilot instrument was still exploratory. Whereas the pilot project queried only agency heads, the second instrument also interviewed administrative staff and agency board members. This was done in order to determine whether staff and/or board members differed substantially from agency heads in their perception of administrative training needs. Again, the purpose was exploratory so as to ascertain whether it was sufficient for the final instrument to interview only heads of agencies.

A randomized sample of 20% of the total universe of 568 agencies was obtained.[1] This was done in order to collect data from a sample population of agency heads for the semi-structured instrument. Random sampling as a method of selection was used in order to ensure that all possible samples of a fixed size had the same probability of being chosen from the universe in question (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 118). This resulted in a final random sample of 30 agencies. These agencies constitute a sample of the various religious institutions, schools, hospitals, ideological-political organizations, colleges and universities, voluntary associations, correctional institutions, and rehabilitation facilities, etc., of the larger population of community service agencies contained in the WIS file.

---

[1]The UNIVAC 1106 computer data processing facility at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was utilized to obtain a 20% random sample.

Methodology

Three instruments were developed to collect data for the project. A breakdown of the instruments and respondent groups utilized to obtain information on administrative training needs is shown in Table 1. Since only 7 administrative heads of

Table 1

Instruments and Respondent Groups Utilized to Obtain Information on Administrative Training Needs

Instrument	Respondent	Count
1. Open-Ended Pilot Interview Questionnaire (1 1/2-2 hours in-person depth interview)	Agency Head	7
2. Semi-Structured Questionnaire (15 minute telephone survey)	Agency Head	30
	Administrative Staff	36[a]
	Board Member	83[b]
3. Structured Questionnaire (15 minute telephone survey)	Agency Head	444[c]

[a]Out of 38 administrative staff initially contacted, 36 responded.

[b]Out of 101 board members initially contacted, 83 responded.

[c]Out of 568 agency heads contacted, 444 responded.

agencies were interviewed for the Open-Ended Pilot Questionnaire, the data base derived was sufficient to provide indicators of need, but not adequate to make valid statements about administrative training needs. The final questionnaire, the structured instrument, was formulated by refining and modifying the Semi-Structured Questionnaire based on data generated from the

administration of the Semi-Structured Questionnaire to a random sample of 30 agency heads, 36 administrative staff, and 83 board members. The data gathered at this point was used to formulate a Structured Questionnaire that would be expedient given time, cost, and utility constraints, effective in terms of assessing administrative training needs, and efficient in terms of conducting the survey.

1. Open-Ended Pilot Questionnaire

A review of the literature provided a conceptual framework for the formulation of open-ended questions on "what is needed?" Drucker's (1974, p. 400) five basic management skill or task categories (a) setting objectives, i.e., determining goals and communicating these; (b) organizing, i.e., analyzing, classifying, and dividing activities, decisions, and relations into manageable jobs; (c) motivating and communicating, i.e., making a team out of the people that are responsible for various jobs via constant communication to and from his subordinates, supervisors, and colleagues; (d) developing people, i.e., others and himself; and (e) measuring, i.e., analyzing, interpreting, and appraising performance, were found to be most appropriate for this study. Once the above competency base was established, open-ended questions were constructed to enable the respondents to discuss in depth their training needs in the particular skill area. Expert testimony was sought to validate the instrument and three pilot tests were conducted. Though the various advantages and disadvantages of depth interviewing as reported

in the literature will not be repeated here,[1] the procedures followed were productive. In addition, the purpose of the open-ended questions was to enable the respondents to be less restrictive in their answers, and to provide the investigator with unanticipated concepts or variables which would be useful in formulating more structured questions.

Aside from gathering general demographic information, the questions were formulated to conform to three purposes of the study. The purposes are as follows: (a) to determine the kinds of administrative training needs agency administrators have in the internal management of service agencies, (b) to determine the pre- and in- service training of agency administrators, and (c) to determine the educational resources and delivery systems available to agency administrators.

The personal interviews lasted one and one-half to two hours. These interviews, which were conducted by the investigator, included a total of 22 questions. The answers were written out by the interviewer and in some instances supplemented by supporting material obtained from the agency director such as brochures or pamphlets on agency goals.

2. Semi-Structured Questionnaire

The same three purposes which guided the construction, field testing, and revision of the Open-Ended Pilot Questionnaire apply to the Semi-Structured Questionnaire. However, the analysis of the questions and responses to the initial

---

[1]See Phillips, 1971; Isaac, 1971; Wiseman and Aron, 1970; and Hyman, 1955.

instrument suggested a number of modifications in the development of the semi-structured questions. Since this questionnaire was conducted over the telephone to administrative staff and board members in addition to agency heads, changes in the instructions and wording of the questions were also made where appropriate and necessary. Hence, two additional instruments, one for staff and one for board members were printed and administered.

Pilot Questionnaire

The 14 categories which evolved out of the Open-Ended responses were placed into a Strongly Agree-Agree-Disagree-Strongly Disagree response scale to be asked of agency heads, administrative staff, and board members. These 14 categories built on the competency base of Drucker's (1974) five administrative task areas which constituted the conceptual framework for the previous open-ended questionnaire.

Two experienced telephone survey interviewers were hired and trained to preserve uniform objective interview conditions. In order to overcome at least partially some of the disadvantages attached to the use of single item measurement as in the 14 skill areas, each interviewer was given a short definition for the individual categories and instructed to only read these to the respondent. This was primarily done to preserve the unidimensionality of the concept for the respondents (Phillips, 1971, p. 248). All questionnaire items were read from a uniform format and all responses were recorded verbatim. Two weeks before the telephone survey began, a cover letter explaining the pur-

poses of the investigation was sent to the agencies and to the homes or places of work of board members. This letter explained the purposes of the investigation and solicited the cooperation of the respondents. The telephone interviews were conducted over a period of ten consecutive days.

A total of 149 individuals responded to the questionnaire. The responses were then collected, coded, and machine tabulated and percentages were computed, utilizing the UNIVAC 1106 at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Data Processing Center, COLFREQI FORTRAN program.

3. Structured Questionnaire

In keeping with the conceptual framework of the purposes of the study, the questions in this final instrument were a synthesis of recommended competencies outlined in the literature and of the responses by 37 agency heads, 36 administrative staff, and 83 board members to questions on the two previous instruments. Each of these items was checked to provide a frequency count and ranked to provide an estimate of the order of importance.

Agency heads were asked the following: (a) the extent to which they agreed that additional administrative training in 58 specific administrative duties grouped into 7 major category headings would be helpful to them[1] and space was provided for comments, (b) to rank in order of importance four obstacles

[1]A four-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree-Agree-Disagree-Strongly Disagree) was utilized to estimate the extent of agreement.

that sometimes prevent agency administrators from participating in additional administrative training, (c) to state which of 18 formats for administrative training they preferred, (d) to identify their college degree, if any, and in what area, (e) to state the number of years of experience in administration, (f) to state their age, and (g) to state their sex.

A pilot test of the instrument was performed. Revisions were made in the internal ordering of the items and questionnaire pages containing the seven major classifications were presented in random order. Questions were distributed in random order. On one half of the questionnaires, this random order was reversed. In addition, the pages of the instrument were presented in random order to avoid response bias and to equalize the respondent fatigue factor. A cover letter was sent to all 568 agencies outlining the purposes of the study and asking for cooperation.

Six trained interviewers attempted to contact 568 agency administrators to solicit their participation in the 15 minute telephone survey. These 568 agency administrators included the 30 agency heads contacted in the Semi-Structured Questionnaire and the 7 agency heads contacted in the Open-Ended Pilot Questionnaire.

Four hundred forty-four agency administrators out of the 568 agencies listed in the WIS file participated in the study.[1]

---

[1]Some of the agencies were incorporated into larger enterprises, other agencies were no longer in existence from the time the orginal computer print out listing was obtained, and others were closed during the summer months when the interviewing took place.

Some of the reasons for not participating were lack of time and interest. Some respondents wanted the questionnaire mailed out to them before they would respond. This was not done and they subsequently refused.

The questionnaires were collected, the questionnaire pages reordered for coding purposes, index numbers were assigned to responses and the responses were machine tabulated and verified to facilitate computerized data analysis.

An analysis of crossbreaks utilizing the Chi-Square technique described by Kerlinger (1973), on each of the 58 items broken out by respondent characteristics, was performed to determine statistical significance of the observed response frequencies. The .05 level of significance was utilized to test for differences within the categories of age, sex, experience, educational level, and degree area.

The power of the instrument to generate data reliably was tested by computing an alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) for the 58 items grouped into the 7 major administrative training classifications. The combined alpha was a = .9599, which indicates an extremely high degree of internal consistency.

The major procedures used to attain reliability were as follows:

1. crosschecking by six different people of response coding
2. standardization of category description for interviewers
3. random assembly of structured questionnaire pages to eliminate possible respondent bias based on question order

(of the 500 questionnaires, half had item ordering arranged according to one random order and the other half according to the reverse random order)

4. prohibition of interviewers' adding any verbal material not contained in the questionnaire.

The following validation techniques were applied.

1. pilot test
2. expert testimony
3. use of varying questionnaire formats such as open-ended, semi-structured, and structured
4. review of the literature to obtain basic competency categories
5. clarifying, expanding, and modifying questionnaire categories and instructions based on interim results, during the instrument development phase.

Major Findings

An analysis of the data base generated from the Structured Questionnaire, along with a discussion of some of the conclusions that can be drawn and some of the implications that these conclusions and findings portend follows.

The perceived administrative training needs of community service agency administrators in Milwaukee County are presented in Figure 1--Taxonomy of Desired Competencies. This taxonomy was developed from the responses to the 58 training need items grouped into 7 subject areas of the Structured Questionnaire. These 58 training items which agency administrators perceive as

Figure 1

Taxonomy of Desired Competencies

Respondent Agreement on Importance of Training Needs	Training Areas			
	I Legal Requirements	II Personnel Administration	III Program Development	IV Output Assessment and Evaluation
Major (over 70%)	Law Government Rules and Regulations	Administrative Leadership Identifying Supervising Responsibilities Establishing Standards of Performance Placing Staff Establishing Controls to Monitor Progress	Program Planning Setting Priorities and Timetables Coordinating Work Funding Procedures Proposal Writing Organizing Policy Planning	Supervision Output Assessment Quality Control Program Evaluation Assessing Organizational Goals Revising Operational Goals
Moderate (between 50-70%)	Negotiations	Developing Job Descriptions In-Service Training Staff Development	Coordinating Resources	Staff Evaluation Accountability
Minor (less than 50%)	Grievance Procedures Funding Legislation	Volunteer Training		

Figure 1--Continued

Respondent Agreement on Importance of Training Needs	Training Areas		
	V Communication and Motivation	VI Finance	VII General Management Techniques
Major (Over 70%)	Committee Meetings Motivation Board-Staff Relationship Group Dynamics Utilizing Appropriate Communication Media Public Relations Relationship with Funding Organizations Communication Stimulating Action	Purchasing Procedures Fund Raising Fiscal Management Program Budgeting Payroll Procedures Fringe Benefits	Planning Decision-Making Problem Solving Administration
Moderate (between 50-70%)	Human Relations	Budget Forecasting Accounting Procedures Trusts, Probate	Computer Management Facilities and Maintenance Upkeep Office Management Management by Objectives
Minor (less than 50%)			

The Data Base above can be found in Chamberlain, P. "Assessing Administrative Training Needs of Community Service Agency Administrators." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, 1975.

helpful are arranged by percentage of respondent agreement on importance of training needs into the categories of Major, Moderate, and Minor. Items to which more than 70% of the respondents agreed that additional administrative training would be helpful are grouped in the Major importance category; items with a level of agreement between 50% to 70% are grouped in the Moderate importance category; and items receiving less than a 50% level of agreement are assigned to the Minor importance category.

Confining interpretation of these data to the universe of the 7 subject areas and the 58 perceived administrative training needs, several conclusions can be drawn. Among these conclusions are, first, that training opportunities could include more specific offerings in Communication and Motivation, Program Development, Output Assessment and Evaluation, and Finance to meet a set of needs that are perceived as being of major importance (at least 67% of subject area items included). Second, half of the items listed under Personnel Administration and General Management Techniques, and 60% of the items listed under Legal Requirements, were not considered to be of major importance by at least 70% of agency heads. This suggests either that these administrators feel that training in these particular items would not be helpful, that they do not need training in these items, or that these administrators do not fully realize the value of training items that are perceived as being of moderate or minor importance. Third, perhaps the most salient conclusion that can be drawn from Figure 1, as a result of the

fact that a large number of agency heads, 313 (70%) of 444, perceive 39 training needs (67% of the listed 58 items) as being of major importance, is that this study can provide administrative training program planners with an identifiable population and a number of content items around which an administrative training curriculum can be structured.

The responses to Structured Questionnaire items on educational background and preparation of agency administrators show that the majority of agency heads have formal degrees--33% Bachelor's and 26% Master's--in areas such as Social Science, Behavioral Science, Humanities, and Law. Aprroximately 35% of the agency administrators have no college degree, and less than 7% of the agency administrators have a degree in Administration. This may explain the large number of respondents who felt additional administrative training would be helpful to them. The need for additional training is further supported by the finding that over 50% of the respondents to the Semi-Structured Questionnaire items on vocational, technical, business, etc. training stated they had received no previous training. Moreover, in another Semi-Structured Questionnaire item, types of administrative training currently received, 77% of the agency heads and 87% of the administrative staff replied that they were not receiving any training. Given these data on training background and preparation of community service agency administrators it would appear these agency heads could benefit from additional administrative training programs. Although most of the agency heads have 4-7

years (27%) and 15 years or more (26%) experience in administration, a clear majority at all levels of years of experience, including the 19% between 8 and 11 years, 14% between 12 and 15 years, 9% between 2 and 3 years, and 5% with less than 2 years experience responded that additional administrative training would be helpful to them. However, the relationship between years of experience and training preferences shows that the more senior administrators perceive training needs to be acute in the following list of questionnaire items: (a) Staff evaluation, (b) Quality Control, (c) Program Evaluation, and (d) Administration. Less experienced administrators (5%) report no set of systematic preferences.

With regard to desirable administrative training formats, the findings of the study indicate that most agency heads prefer length of training to be 1-3 days. They prefer an instructional technique utilizing Professional Experts and Small Group Discussions and/or Workshops as the forms for administrative training. It might also be noted that the least preferred length of training is Summer School; the least preferred technique is Lectures; and the least preferred form is Classroom. These findings could be extremely valuable to persons who are responsible for planning and structuring in-service training opportunities which would be appealing to agency administrators.

In the determination of impediments to administrative training, the findings revealed that Lack of Time is the

primary obstacle. This finding contributes to a further understanding of the preference of agency heads for training opportunities which last between 1 to 3 days. Moreover, since the community service agency administrators who responded are currently working, it is reasonable to assume that they do not have the time to participate in lengthy training sessions.

The identification of educational resources and delivery systems available for the training of agency administrators was not pursued in the Structured Questionnaire. Responses to items in the Semi-Structured Questionnaire that were intended to elicit such information indicated that 39% of the agency heads knew of no delivery systems in Milwaukee County which offer administrative training specifically for agency administrators whereas the remaining 61% of the agency heads mentioned various universities and colleges in the county. This item was dropped from the Structured Questionnaire in order to shorten the interview time required to administer the instrument. However, program planners utilizing the administrative training needs as a data base must identify delivery systems and structure these in such a manner that the content and format of training opportunities is consistent with expressed preferences of agency administrators in this study.

Implications for Action

Given the data base generated in this study, along with the conclusions derived, a Department of Administrative Leader-

ship in the field of educational administration could conceivably design and implement in-service training opportunities for community service agency administrators. Such a department has a wide variety of experts who are trained in both theoretical and technical aspects of administration. There, professional experts have the technical competence to develop sophisticated training protocols in the areas reported to be needed. Items such as Government Rules and Regulations, Establishing Standards of Performance, Program Planning, Supervision, Group Dynamics, Program Budgeting, and Problem Solving are representative of the administrative training needs that agency heads identified as being of major importance (see Figure 1). These same items of interest represent skills and knowledges that are taught by professional experts in a Department of Administrative Leadership. The training areas and attendant 58 training needs provide a focus for a core of community service agency administration courses and skills.

Whereas there may be some consulting firm, institute, or training program that could deliver a particular administrative skill, better than a Department of Administrative Leadership, in terms of a capability to design, implement, and follow-up on a comprehensive and coordinated administrative training program suited to the expressed needs of community service agency administrators, a Department of Administrative Leadership has the advantage in several ways. The faculty of such a depart-

ment are capable of designing such training and they are composed of the type of professional experts that agency heads prefer. They have the breadth of knowledge and skill to cover the entire range of the perceived training needs of agency heads. Further, a Department of Administrative Leadership, through cooperative agreements with a Department of Adult Education or a Continuing Studies Unit or an Extension Program, could arrange workshops, seminars, and conferences of short duration to accommodate the time constraint in which many administrators find themsleves. Housed within a School of Education, a Department of Administrative Leadership is constantly immersed in an atmosphere that fosters on-going renewal of instructional methods and formats, which should in turn enhance the probability that the administrative training opportunities offered by such a department would employ the most efficient and effective pedagogical approach. Moreover, the fact that such a department is part of a post-secondary institution increases the opportunity for agency heads to earn academic credits and broaden their backgrounds in the area of administration while they continue to work in their respective organizations; and for those agency heads who desire a degree in administration, the advantages are obvious.

However, there are some considerations which must be dealt with before a Department of Administrative Leadership could successfully design and implement a program of action to meet the in-service training needs of community service agency administra-

tors. First, although the potential for flexibility is there, and often exists on a low-keyed level, most academic departments still rely heavily on the classroom as the setting for instruction, and the semester or quarter as the length of a period of instruction. All three of these instructional formats rated low vis-a-vis agency head preferences. A second consideration is the credit system that is used by most post-secondary academic instituitons. Not only is the credit used as a unit of academic and administrative accounting, it has now become a unit of fiscal accounting. The credit system tends to reduce the institution's options in getting participants to pay for services, since fees are fixed. Non-credit offerings are often viewed as a liability since they do not generate student contact hours, which in turn constitute full time equivalencies and generate the major portion of a department's operating budget. In sum, the credit system mitigates against faculty devoting time to activities that do not produce student contact hours.

A third consideration that must be dealt with before a Department of Administrative Leadership develops training programs is the "town-gown" split. That is to say that since this study is dealing with agency administrators whose business is "community service," are academicians in a Department of Administrative Leadership aware of and sensitive to the particular working environment of these administrators? Do they need to be in order to provide effective administrative training, especially in the areas of Personnel Administration, Communication and

Motivation, or Human Relations? These questions, along with the other considerations mentioned, suggest directions for future research.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has identified a population of new potential students for continuing learning activities as evidenced by the number who indicated an interest in seeking additional administrative training. From the data base generated, there is sufficient input to contribute towards further development of an organic theory of administration which can now incorporate information on what administrators actually do in their work as an additional perspective to current theories dealing with leadership, role, group dynamics, structure, and program planning. The perceived training needs comprise a set of competencies which can be incorporated in the development of an interdisciplinary program. Also, the instruments devised and used in this study can be utilized to replicate the efforts made here on a periodic basis in order to determine if training opportunities available are still relevant.

This study provides the data base which a Department of Administrative Leadership can utilize in developing and implementing administrative training programs. However, the ultimate success of any in-service training program designed for agency administrators rests on the professional experts'

ability to organize the in-service training content and procedure around the agency administrators, placing greater emphasis on the needs of these individuals and their organizational and community contexts than on conventional standard courses and teaching procedures. As community service agency administrators avail themselves of these programs and are trained to function more effectively, both the Department of Administrative Leadership and agency administrators are contributing improved service to the community of which they are a part.

REFERENCES

Campbell, R. "What peculiarities in educational administration make it a special case?" In A. Halpin (ed.), Administrative theory in education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

Chamberlain, P. "Assessing Administrative Training Needs of Community Service Agency Administrators." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Milwaukee, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, 1975.

Cronbach, L. "Coefficient Alpha and the internal structure of texts." Psychometrika, 1951, 16.

Culbertson, J. "Common and specialized content in the preparation of administrators." In Donald G. Leu & Herbert C. Rudman (Eds.), Preparation programs for school administrators: common and specialized learnings for various administrative positions. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965.

Drucker, P. Management. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1974.

Goldhammer, K. "Implications for change in training programs." Knowledge Production and Utilization in Educational Administration, 1968, 174-184.

Hasenfeld, Y., & English, R. (Eds.). Human service organizations: a book of readings. Michigan: American University Press, 1974.

Hyman, H. Survey design and analysis: principles, cases, and procedures. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.

Isaac, S. Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp Publisher, 1971.

Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Litchfield, E. "Notes on a general theory of administration." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, 1, 1.

Miklos, E. Training-in-common for educational, public and business administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

National Manpower Council Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

Occupational outlook handbook, 1974-75 edition. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

Parsons, T. "Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, 1, 225-239.

Phillips, B. Social research, strategy and tactics. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971.

Thompson, J. "Organizational management of conflict." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1960, 4, 389-409.

U.S. Congress. Manpower report of the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Walton, J. "The dissimilarity of educational administration." Public Administrative Review, 1970, 30(1), 56-59.

Weber, M. The theory of social and economic organization. Trans. A. M. Henderson & Talcott Parsons. New York: Free Press, 1947.

Wiseman, J., & Aron, M. Field projects for sociology students. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1970.